

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed August 3, 2006. Claims 8, 10-16, 26-30, and 32-36 are presently pending in the application. Claims 9, 27 and 31 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Examiner noted that dependent claim 10 appears to be lacking antecedent basis, and possibly should depend from claim 9 instead of claim 8. The undersigned has reviewed this and agrees with the Examiner. However, in view of the amendments to independent claim 8, from which claim 10 depends, it is believed that this rejection has been rendered moot. Additional wording has been included in dependent claim 10 to make clear which of the two bearing cups is being referred to in claim 10. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the §112, second paragraph rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 8-16 and 26-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Baninger (U.S. Patent 1,851,561; hereinafter "Baninger"). For the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, claim 8 has been amended to include the limitations of dependent claim 9, and further to include language particularly pointing out that the first bearing cup allows only a predetermined limited amount of rotational movement of the second bearing cup, while allowing a predetermined degree of axial movement of the second bearing cup relative to the first bearing cup. Claim 26 has been amended to include the

limitations of dependent claim 27, and further to include a limitation regarding a planar biasing spring disposed axially between said first inner and outer races and the second inner and outer races to provide a predetermined axial pre-loading force to be applied to the rolling elements. Independent claim 33 has been amended to make clear that the engagement of the first and second bearing cups allows only a predetermined amount of rotational movement before said second bearing cup is prevented from rotating relative to said first bearing cup. These limitations are not shown or suggested by Baninger.

Baninger appears to involve a bearing mounting apparatus for supporting a pair of bearing assemblies. The apparatus involves using a first bearing cup 84 (Figure 3) and a second bearing cup 86, and disposing a pair of coil springs 96 and 98 between the two bearing cups, and between an annular ring or rib 94. There does not appear to be any provision for enabling a small, predetermined degree of rotational movement of one of the bearing cups relative to the other, as is present with the embodiments of the present application. As explained in the pending application in connection with Figure 3, the slots 64 are slightly wider than the teeth 62. Thus, when the bearing cups 32 and 36 are positioned in engagement with one another, a slight, predetermined degree of rotational movement is allowed between the bearing cups. This is in addition to the small degree of axial movement which is permitted because of the depth of the slots 64 and 64' being slightly greater than the projecting distance of each tooth 62 and 62'. Additionally, the tangs 58 project a distance that is less than the depth of the pockets with which they engage, which also allows an additional degree of axial play of the bearing cup relative to the structure in which the cup is mounted. Thus, the various

embodiments of the present application allow a small degree of rotational movement, as well as a small degree of axial movement.

With specific reference to amended claim 26, a "planar biasing spring" has been set forth. Again, this is not disclosed or suggested by Baninger. Baninger requires the use of two coil springs positioned adjacent one another between the bearing cups 84 and 86 in order to provide axial preloading for the bearings. As will be appreciated, this requires more axial space and a more complicated construction for the bearing assembly. Furthermore, Baninger would not appear to be useable with a planar spring, such as described and illustrated in the present application, without significant modifications. For at least these reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of independent claims 8, 26 and 33, in view of Baninger, is most respectfully requested.

Furthermore, in view of the amendments made to the independent claims, it is believed that all the remaining, pending dependent claims are now in allowable form.

Conclusion

It is believed that the entire application is in form for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest opportunity. If the Examiner has any questions, the undersigned may be contacted at (248) 641-1229 at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 3, 2006

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600
MDE/jo